

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/584,252	05/31/2000	Robert P. Martin	10002239-1	3762

22879 7590 09/29/2004

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

NOBAHAR, ABDULHAKIM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/584,252

Applicant(s)

MARTIN ET AL.

Examiner

Abdulhakim Nobahar

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-15 and 17-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-10,12-15 and 17-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this **National Stage** application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Arguments

1. This communication is in response to applicant's response received on June 15, 2004.
2. Amendments to page 9, line 23-page 10, line 11 of the specification that do not add any new matter to the specification are acknowledged.
3. Cancellation of claims 2, 3 and 16 are acknowledged.
4. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but with respect to claims 1, 4-10, 12-15 and 17-20, they are not persuasive.
5. The claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) would be changed to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as it is the appropriate rejection.
6. On page 8, lines 27-31 of the remarks, applicants argue "McNeill does not disclose a shared computer system... in which the multiple clients sharing resources in the computer system are completely isolated from each other."

The word "completely" is a qualifier that is not introduced in any of the pending claims and it has not been elaborated in the specification.

With regard to isolation of clients from each other, McNeill discloses that the shared system is configured in such a way that clients in different connectivity group can not communicate with each other (col. 1, lines 54-67 and col. 2, lines 39-50)

7. On page 9, lines 1-8 of the remarks, applicants argue “McNeill also does not disclose a plurality of client connection ports connected to at least one VLAN switch.” and “McNeill does not disclose that external clients may be connected to the network through client connection ports to share network resources while being isolated from each another.”

McNeill discloses that a plurality of clients from different domains as shown in Fig. 1 are connected to stations in domain (VLAN) 116P via switch 128.1. The connectivity of one client is isolated from another if they are from different domains as discussed above and they are connected to the VLAN switch through different ports (see, for example, col. 3, lines 57-64; col. 7, lines 30-51).

8. On page 9, lines 9-10 of the remarks, applicants argue “McNeill also does not disclose a configuration engine connected to a VLAN switch.”

On the contrary, McNeill discloses (see Fig. 1) that a configuration management station (computer) 124M is connected to the VLAN switch 128.1.

9. On page 9, lines 10-11 of the remarks, applicants argue “McNeill does not disclose that switch 128.1 is a VLAN switch.”

On the contrary, McNeill discloses that the switch 128.1 is a VLAN switch (see, for example, col. 1, lines 61-67; col. 3, lines 20-30; col. 11, lines 30-39; col. 12, lines 40-45.

10. However, in light of the above submission, the rejection of pending claims 1, 5, 10, 12-15 and 17-20 under 35 U. S. C. § 102(e) and claims 4-9 under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) are as follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 5, 10, 12-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McNeil et al. (6,167,052; hereinafter McNeil).

3. Regarding claims 1, 5, 13 and 20, McNeill discloses methods and systems for establishing secure network connectivity (see abstract) that provides a plurality of computers (stations) connected to switches (see, for example, Fig. 1, where in Domain

Art Unit: 2132

116P, Stations 124.1 and 124.2 are connected to Switches 128.1 and 128.2). McNeil also discloses that stations (corresponding to the recited clients) from another domain (see, for example, Fig. 1, Domain 116Q, Station 124.3 or clients from Domain 170 via Internet) are connected through designated ports to switch 128.1 in Domain 116P (see, for example, col. 3, lines 7-16). McNeil further discloses the deployment of a management station (see, for example, Fig. 1, Domain 116P, Station 124M) corresponding to the recited configuration engine connected to the switch 128.1, in order to configure this switch (see, for example, Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 35-50). Switches are used to create virtual local area networks (VLANs) in order to restrict connectivity between stations (corresponding to the recited isolating plurality of client connection ports from one another) (see, for example, col. 1, lines 54-67).

4. Regarding claims 10 and 18, McNeil discloses that routers are connected to the client ports on a switch (see, for example, Fig. 1, where Router 130.1 is connected to the Switch 128.1 ports of VLAN 140a). McNeil further discloses that the management station 124M is used to configure the router 130.1 for directing the client connections (see, for example, col. 4, lines 9-46 and col. 5, lines 8-20).

5. Regarding claim 19, McNeil discloses that management station creates access control lists (ACLs) and allow connections based on the ACLS, which corresponds to the recited authenticating identification of client (see, for example, col. 2, lines 26-34; col. 3, line 65-col. 4, line 6; col. 6, lines 14-24).

6. Regarding claims 12 and 17, McNeil discloses that firewalls are also used to further control the access of users to the resources on a shared system (see, for example, col. 2, lines 1-5; col. 9, lines 32-49).
7. Regarding claims 14 and 15, McNeil discloses that the management station includes software and provides a graphical user interface for network administrator to configure the VLAN (see, for example, abstract', Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 38-41; col. 9, lines 35-43).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNeil et al. (6,167,052; hereinafter McNeil) in view of Specht (6,414,958 B1).
10. Regarding claim 4, McNeil does not expressly disclose to connect at least two client connection ports to the same one of computers that provides services to clients.

Specht discloses a multi-port switch that provides secure VLAN connections among network devices and a network management module, which is also connected to

Art Unit: 2132

the switching section (see, for example, abstract and col. 4, lines 17-25). Specht further discloses a configuration of switch that provides a VLAN that includes at least two of the client connection ports to be securely connected to the same resources. See, for example, Fig. 8A and Fig. 8B. In Fig. 8B, for example, two connection ports that are belonged to the users A and B are connected to the same corporate WAN resource via VLAN 895a.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the configuration option taught in Specht in the network connectivity method of McNeil, because it would satisfies different requirements (or provides different VLAN clients connection arrangement) (col. 4, lines 39-50 and col. 11, lines 29-32).

11. Regarding claim 5, Specht discloses:

Connecting at least one client computer to said shared computer system through at least one of said plurality of client connection ports. See, for example, Fig. 4.

12. Regarding claim 6, Specht discloses:

at least one client computer is connected to said shared computer system across a dedicated line. See, for example, Fig. 8B, where only user B has access to the Internet via VLAN 895b that corresponds to a dedicated line.

13. Regarding claims 7 and 8, McNeil discloses that the implemented switches allow users to access resources over the Internet. See, for example, Fig. 1 that users are

Art Unit: 2132

allowed to access, for example, Station 124.1 over the Internet 170 and through Switch 128.1.

14. Regarding claim 9, Specht discloses that the multi-port switch for secure VLAN connections is usable for a broad range of network connections (see, for example, col. 6, line 59-col. 7, line 4).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 11 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdulhakim Nobahar whose telephone number is 703-305-8074. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 703-305-1830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abdulhakim Nobahar
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

AN *a.n.*

September 22, 2004

Gilberto Barrón
GILBERTO BARRÓN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100